

157

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report  
For CDRU # 6544 Case file # 95-259894.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Case resulted in guilty plea. No transcript.

## INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

152

Independent Review conducted by: Steve RobertsonArea(s) of Expertise: Hair and FiberReview commenced at: 2:30 PM (Time), 03/15/2001 (Date)File #: 95-259894Laboratory #(s): 40224002  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Examiner(s) &amp; Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
<u>RQ</u>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>UL, PR</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: \_\_\_\_\_

Testimony Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Pages: \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 40224002 Date: May 8, 1984  
Laboratory Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Laboratory Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_Examiner Bench Notes of: RQLaboratory Number: 40224002  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_Page 1 of 3Initials: SR

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

153

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letter (dated 2-16-84)

### Results of Review

File #: 95-259894

Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1, Q3-Q16, Q21-Q24, K1, K2,

K5-K10

#### Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?  
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?  
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

#### Review of Testimony:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

☒ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SEA

## Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.  
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-259894

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, even with the best notes, there is no way to determine the comparison was performed correctly.

#2: The examination results set forth in the laboratory report are supported by the bench notes, but the documentation is marginally adequate. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil. RQ uses abbreviations to indicate the microscopic characteristics of the hair. These abbreviations are difficult to interpret. The technician's notes do not document that hair was recovered from the Q items.

Review completed at: 2:45 PM (Time), 03/15/2001 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0:15 hours

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts  
(Signature)

03/15/2001

(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: SR